

REMARKS

With this Response, claims 28, 30 and 32 are amended. Claims 49-61 are added. Claims 1-27 and 33-48 are cancelled. Therefore, claims 28-32 and 49-61 are pending.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 26-31 have been objected to because of informalities. The claims have been amended to define the acronyms as they are introduced in the claims.

Applicant has further amended claim 32 separating the multiple dependency into two singularly dependent claims: claim 32 and new claim 49. Claim 32, as amended is singularly dependent upon claim 28 and recites the additional limitations of cancelled claim 21. New claim 49 is also singularly dependent upon claim 28 and recites the additional limitations of withdrawn claim 33.

On this basis, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the objections to formalities in claims 26-32.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant acknowledges that claims 28-32 were deemed allowable.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

Claims 33-48 have been cancelled in response to the Examiner identifying such claims as being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has canceled claims 21-27, rendering the Examiner's rejection moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 21-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2003/0086514 to Ginis (hereinafter “Ginis”).

Applicant has canceled claims 21-27, rendering the Examiner’s rejection moot.

NEW CLAIMS

Claim 49

New claim 49 is dependent upon claim 28 and recites the additional limitations of claim 33. Applicant respectfully submits new claim 49, dependent upon allowed claim 28, is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 28.

Claims 50–55

New claims 50 – 55 recite a system as depicted in Applicant’s Figure 3 and further described in pages 18 and 19 of the specification. Claim 50 recites limitations commensurate in scope to those recited in claim 28, deemed allowable, and therefore claim 50 should also be allowable. Claims 51-55 are dependent upon claim 50 should therefore be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 50.

Claims 56-61

New claims 56 – 61 recite a computer program product as described in page 35 and 36 of the specification. Claim 56 recites limitations commensurate in scope to those recited in claim 28, deemed allowable, and therefore claim 56 should also be allowable. Claims 57-61 are dependent upon claim 56 and should therefore be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 56.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests examination of the above-identified application in view of the response.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections of the claims have been overcome herein, placing all pending claims in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the above-identified application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit any deficiencies or overpayments in connection with this submission to Deposit Account No. 02-2666, and is requested to notify us of same.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: June 19, 2007

/Gregory D. Caldwell/
Gregory D Caldwell
Reg. No. 39,926